

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

11th January 2017

UPDATE REPORT OF DIVISIONAL DIRECTOR PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.1	PA/16/03188	19 Senrab Street, E1 0QE	Retrospective planning permission for a rear dormer window (with alterations) to facilitate a loft conversion.

1.0 Additional supporting application material received

1.1 The applicant has provided a document which includes photographs of the site and photographs of other dormer windows in the locality. None of these however, benefit from planning permission.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Officers' original recommendation to **REFUSE** planning permission remains unchanged.

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.2	PA/16/02295	(Locksley Estate Site D) Land at Salmon Lane and adjacent to 1-12 Parnham Street, London	Residential development comprising 20 one, two, three and four bedroom flats available for affordable rent. The height of the building ranges from six storeys to nine storeys.

1.0 Additional/Further consultation responses

- 1.1 Since the publication of the committee report, the Council has received further comments from the Councils Biodiversity officer and the Canal and River Trust. These are summarised below.

Biodiversity

- 1.2 The Councils Biodiversity officer has suggested further off-site mitigation adjacent to Ashpark House for the loss of existing habitat. Biodiversity enhancements proposed would consist of a new native hedge and wildflower meadow, both of which would contribute to Local Biodiversity Action Plan targets.

- 25 metres of new mixed native hedge along the north-western edge of the green. This would replace about half of the hedge lost along the Salmon Lane edge of Site D. This would involve planting a double line of native shrubs.
- 125 square metres of meadow in the northern part of the green, which is not shaded by trees. This would involve removing the existing turf and topsoil, adding a low-nutrient substrate such as crushed chalk or sand, mixed with subsoil, and sowing with an appropriate wildflower seed mix.

- 1.3 The off-site mitigation is proposed approximately 90m east of the application site as shown in the following image.



- 1.4 Officers are supportive of these additional mitigation measures and propose they are secured via the imposition of a condition requiring their implementation.

Canal and River Trust (CaRT)

- 1.5 The Council has received a consultation response advising CaRT object to the application for the following two reasons.

- a) Impact on the character and appearance of the Regent's Canal conservation Area
- b) Impact on the character and appearance of the Blue Ribbon Network, and its users.

- 1.6 In summary, CaRT are supportive of the principle of the development but consider the proposal in particular by virtue of its height and lack of setback from the Canal Towpath to have substantial harm to the Regent's Canal Conservation Area.

- 1.7 The impact of the application on the conservation area has been considered within the main report and officers in line with the advice from colleagues from the Councils Conservation team, consider the impact to be acceptable, with the quality of design and detailing to preserve and enhance the Regent's Canal Conservation Area.

- 1.8 In relation to the lack of setback from the towpath, officers have taken a different view to CaRT and consider the existing Tow path wall (approx. 4m high) helps channel immediate views at a human scale along the Canal rather than drawing attention away from the canal.

- 1.9 From views north looking south, the proposed tall building is considered to site comfortably alongside similar tall buildings within the immediate context.

- 1.10 CaRT have also requested conditions and informatives in the event the Council are minded to grant planning permission. The conditions relate to:

- Plant Room Extraction for Towpath Elevation
- Construction Environmental Management Plan (already covered in the committee report)
- Impact on the structural integrity of the towpath, due to the proximity of the proposed development;
- Impact on the water quality of the canal.

- 1.11 These conditions are considered relevant and officers are minded to include them within the application,

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 Officers' original recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission remains unchanged, subject to the following additional conditions:

1. Condition requiring further biodiversity measures off-site
2. Details of Plant Room Extraction for the Towpath
3. Method Statement for the development (protecting the Towpath wall)
4. Full details of surface water drainage

Agenda item no	Reference no	Location	Proposal / Title
5.3	PA/16/02789	William Brinson Centre, 3-5 Arnold Road, London, E3 4NT	Demolition of existing building, construction of an 8 storey building and a 6 storey building to provide 62 dwellings (affordable housing tenure) and 398 sq.m B1 floorspace with amenity space, access, cycle parking, landscaping and associated works

1.0 Ownerships

- 1.1 The main report to committee, does not mention the applicant's details. Officers can confirm he applicant is the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.

2.0 Corrections

- 2.1 Paragraph 2.4 of the report incorrectly refers to 20 units proposed. This is incorrect and should refer to 62 units.
- 2.2 Paragraph 8.43 refers to 'stucco and stone detailing' around the windows and doors. The application was amended with the detailing now proposing brick, concrete and metalwork detailing.
- 2.3 Paragraph 8.99 fails to mention that 43% of the garden will meet the recommended standard.
- 2.4 Paragraph 8.107 suggests four remaining windows flats 8,15,16,17 and 18 are blinkered by their own side returns balconies. To clarify, first floor windows at each of 8,15,16 and 17 have Vertical Sky Component reductions of greater than 20% however the report notes the failures are partly due to the outlook of these windows being restricted by their own side returns which restrict daylight to these windows.
- 2.5 Overall, officers are satisfied that daylight/sunlight matters have been fully assessed by officers and are considered acceptable.

3.0 Further objections

- 3.1 Since the publication of the committee report, the Council has received two additional representations from previous objectors, re-iterating their objection to the proposal and requesting their objection is circulated.
- 3.2 The second objector raises daylight concerns from the rear properties of Tomlin's Grove, this is covered by paragraph 2.4 above. The objector also questions why an heritage statement was not submitted with the application. In response to the second point, it is noted that the site abuts two conservation areas and there are a number of listed buildings, the site itself is not within a conservation area as such, the acknowledge of the sites heritage surroundings in particular it's Victorian and Georgian period housing within the design and access statement is considered sufficient in this instance.

3.3 Furthermore, officers are satisfied that the heritage impacts of the proposal have been suitably considered by officers in coming to a view on the application.

3.3 No additional planning considerations have been raised that have not previously been covered within the original committee report.

4.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 Officers' original recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission remains unchanged.

